

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claim has been canceled. Claims 1, 13, 19, and 25-28 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,216,178 of Stracovsky ("Stracovsky"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 25-28 include limitations that are not disclosed by Stracovsky. Specifically, independent claim 25 as amended recites as follows:

25. A method, comprising:

sequentially delivering during a plurality of transfer periods of a memory access transaction information corresponding to both an activate command and a cache fetch command from a memory controller to a memory module over a plurality of command lines of a memory bus, the information being partitioned into a plurality of segments corresponding to the plurality of transfer periods and each segment being transmitted via one of the commands lines within one of the plurality of transfer periods; and

delivering from the memory controller to the memory module during a last transfer period of the plurality of transfer period associated with the memory access transaction information differentiating between an activate command and a cache fetch command.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 25 includes limitations that information regarding an activate command and a cache fetch command is transmitted over a sequence of multiple transfer periods associated with a memory access transaction, where the information is segmented into multiple segments and each of the segments is transmitted within a respective transfer period. However, only the last one of the multiple transfer period is different with respect to an

activate command and a cache fetch command. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are absent from Stracovsky.

Rather, Stracovsky is related to a conventional memory controller for memory access. The Examiner contends that Figures 1A-3C and col. 5, line 49 through col. 9, line 15 of Stracovsky reads on the above limitations (see, 3/30/2004 Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The section of Stracovsky cited by the Examiner contains at least 12 figures and more than three columns of the specification. It appears that the Examiner cited these sections of Stracovsky without pointing out where and how the limitations of claims 25-28 are anticipated by Stracovsky.

In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cited reference. It is respectfully submitted that Stracovsky fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 25 is not anticipated by Stracovsky.

Similarly, independent claims 1, 13, 19, and 27 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 25. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, independent claims 1, 13, 19, and 27 are not anticipated by Stracovsky.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Stracovsky. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stracovsky in view of U.S. published patent application No. 2002/0129215 of Yoo et al. ("Yoo"). Although Yoo claims a benefit of a provisional application that was filed before the filing date of the present application, the filing date of Yoo is after the filing date of the

present application. Therefore, only the disclosure of the provisional may be used against the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that, independent claims 1, 13, and 19 include limitations similar to those set forth above as applied to independent claim 25. It is respectfully submitted that Yoo also fails to disclose or suggest the limitations set forth above. Thus, at least for the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1, 13, and 19 are patentable over Stracovsky in view of Yoo.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, at least for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are patentable over Stracovsky in view of Yoo. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 8/30/2004



Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300